

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed July 6, 2007. Claims 1-20 are pending. The Office Action rejects Claims 1-20. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action of all pending claims in view of the following remarks.

Section 102 and 103 Rejections

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 11, 17-18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0105621 A1 to Kurematsu (“*Kurematsu*”). The Office Action rejects Claims 4, 10, and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kurematsu* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,745,808 to Tintera (“*Tintera*”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons given below.

Claim 1, as amended, is allowable at least because *Kurematsu* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, “a processor capable of determining a first position of an adjustable aperture based at least in part on at least a portion of the data collected by the histogram module, and a second position of the adjustable aperture based at least in part on the first position, the processor further capable of determining a gain to apply to the second frame of the signal based at least in part on the second adjustable aperture position.” The Office Action relies on paragraphs 0074, 0080, and 0082 of *Kurematsu* in rejecting Claim 1 as originally filed, but these paragraphs merely disclose controlling the amount of projection light in conformity with the maximum luminance level of a single frame, which does not constitute “a processor capable of determining . . . a second position of the adjustable aperture based at least in part on the first position.” For at least these reasons, Claim 1 is allowable, as are all claims depending therefrom. Favorable action is requested.

Claim 9 is allowable at least because *Kurematsu* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, “determining a target aperture position based at least in part on a parameter associated with a number of clipped pixels and data stored in a histogram.” The Office Action relies on the histograms of FIGURES 4A through 5B and on paragraphs 0074 and 0082 to teach the above limitation, but these portions of *Kurematsu* fail to disclose, teach, or suggest anything about a “parameter associated with a number of clipped pixels,” as claimed. The Office Action emphasizes that “the amount of projection light is controlled in conformity with the

maximum luminance level of the input signal' which is determined by the histogram data" (Office Action, page 5). Notably, the Office Action fails to even assert, therefore, that *Kurematsu* discloses "determining a target aperture position based at least in part on a parameter associated with a number of clipped pixels" in addition to "data stored in a histogram." It could not correctly make such an assertion, because *Kurematsu* fails to disclose anything about clipped pixels.

Claim 9 is also allowable at least because *Kurematsu* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, "determining a step size to move the aperture based at least in part on a current background storage module and a magnitude of a difference between the target aperture position and a current aperture position." The Office Action relies on FIGURE 1 and paragraphs 0079-0080 in *Kurematsu*, but this is incorrect. In particular, the Office Action states "where a luminance level of 255 acts as the background storage module value for the light modulating element P, and the difference between the target aperture position and a current aperture position is controlled by said light modulating element P" (Office Action, page 5). Notably, the Office Action fails to explicitly indicate any portion of *Kurematsu* it contends meets the "determining a step size" limitation. Instead, the Office Action merely refers to two paragraphs that disclose adjusting the aperture of the movable stop means 20a to two different levels, without disclosing anything about "a step size to move the aperture" or "a difference between the target aperture position and a current aperture position.

For at least the above reasons, Claim 9 is allowable, as are all claims depending therefrom. Favorable action is requested.

Claim 17 is allowable at least for some of the reasons that Claim 9 is allowable. In particular, Claim 17 recites "a processor capable of determining a new position of an adjustable aperture based at least in part on a step size to move the adjustable aperture and a target aperture position, wherein the target aperture position is based at least in part on data of a first frame received by the control module." The Office Action relies on FIGURE 1 and paragraph 0082 in *Kurematsu*, but this is incorrect. Merely controlling the amount of projection light "in conformity with the maximum luminance level of the input signal," does not disclose, teach, or suggest anything about "a step size to move the adjustable aperture" that is in addition to "a target aperture position." For at least this reason, Claim 17 is allowable, as are all claims depending therefrom. Favorable action is requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned Attorney for Applicants at the Examiner's convenience.

Although Applicants believe no fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to **Deposit Account No. 20-0668 of Texas Instruments.**

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants


Bradley P. Williams
Reg. No. 40, 227

Date: October 8, 2007

Correspondence Address:

Customer Number: **23494**